

## REMARKS

Claims 7-17 are pending.

Claims 7-17 are rejected.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 17 are amended.

Applicants request reconsideration of the pending claims.

---

The Board affirmed the sole basis for rejections remaining on appeal – §102 rejections based on de Givry (European Patent Application No. 489,643.) Applicants contend the claims have been clarified to demonstrate their distinction from de Givry.

Claim 7, for example, has been clarified to require at least one end of the upper die to be unsupported.

Claim 9 has been clarified to require refraining from propping at least one of its dies in a region extending laterally from any underlying die.

Claim 10 has been clarified to require allowing at least one end of at least one of its dies to be free of support.

Claim 11 has been clarified to require limiting direct support for a first die to a region between that first die and a second die, with the second die immediately underlying the first die.

Claim 12 has been clarified to require directly holding up at least one of said plurality of dies only in a region that intersects an axis, along which the dies are stacked.

Claim 13 has been clarified to require limiting reinforcement of at least one of the plurality of chips to regions intersecting an axis, along which the chips are spiraled. Dependent claims 14-16 incorporate this limitation.

Claim 17 has been clarified to require at least one die orientation that leaves at least one end of at least one of the dies free of bolstering.

In contrast, de Givry emphasizes placing additional support structures, props, holds, reinforcements, or bolstering under the ends of its crossed chips. (*See de Givry translation at p. 4, ln. 20-21; p. 4, ln. 25; p. 6, ln. 10-16; p. 6, ln. 25-26; p. 7, ln. 21; FIG. 1, element 20; FIG. 2, elements 20, 34, and 36; FIG. 3, elements 20, 30, and 32.*) Having disclosed only the opposite of the claimed clarifications, de Givry cannot be interpreted as anticipating the claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that claims 7-17 are allowable over the applied reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and further requests allowance of all of the pending claims. If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

---

Respectfully submitted,

*Charles Brantley*

Date: 4/12/4

Charles B. Brantley II  
Reg. No. 38,086  
Micron Technology, Inc.  
8000 S. Federal Way  
Boise, ID 83716-9632  
(208) 368-4557  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS